

REMARKS

A telephone interview between Examiners Al-Hashemi and Colan and Dennis Smid (one of the applicant's undersigned attorneys was held on July 24, 2006. The applicant and Mr. Smid wish to thank the Examiners for their time and consideration for such interview.

Claims 9-11 have been canceled. Amended claims 1-8 and new claims 12-17 are in this application.

On the Office Action Summary sheet of the present office action, indications were provided that (i) the specification was objected to by the Examiner, and (ii) the drawings filed on October 28, 2003 were objected to by the Examiner. However, the present office action does not appear to provide any details or explanation as to why the specification and the drawings were objected to by the Examiner. Such matter was discussed during the July 24 interview. At such time, Examiner Colan indicated that there are no objections to the specification and the drawings.

Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. As discussed during the July 24 interview, the applicant's undersigned attorney believes that the claims as presented before the present amendment were directed to statutory subject matter and as such the 101 rejection should have been withdrawn. However, each of the claims has been amended in a manner as discussed during the July 24 interview. Further, during such interview, the Examiners indicated that such amended claims would overcome the 101 rejections. Thus, it

is respectfully requested that the 101 rejection of claims 1-8 be withdrawn.

Claims 1-8¹ were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Steiner et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0065774 A1, filed: May 24, 2001).

Amended independent claim 1 recites in part the following:

"an acting organization object mode designating unit including an input information designating unit operable to designate input information for one or more of the objects, an output information designating unit operable to designate output information for one or more of the objects, an auxiliary input information designating unit operable to designate auxiliary input information for one or more of the objects, and an auxiliary output information designating unit operable to designate auxiliary output information for one or more of the objects; and

. . . .

in which for a respective object, the input information is a first object connected to the respective object which occurs before the respective object, the output information is a second object connected to the respective object which occurs after the respective object, the input auxiliary information is a third object connected to the respective object which occurs before the respective object and which is different from the first object, and the output auxiliary information is a fourth object connected to the respective object which occurs after the respective object and which is different from the second object."

(Emphasis added.)

¹ In the Office Action, the Examiner stated that claims 1-9 were rejected. However, since claim 9 was previously canceled, it is believed that the Examiner intended to reject only claims 1-8.

In explaining the above 102 rejection of claim 1, the Examiner appears to assert that items 201, 203, 205, and 207 of Fig. 2, lines 1-6 of paragraph 0024 on page 2, and lines 1-5 of paragraph 0088 on page 6 of Steiner disclose the above features of claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that such portions of Steiner do not appear to disclose the above-identified features of claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the above 102 rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

For reasons similar to those previously described with regard to claim 1, it is also respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 3-7 are also distinguishable from the Steiner as applied by the Examiner and, as such, it is also respectfully requested that the above 102 rejection of claims 3-7 be withdrawn.

Claims 2 and 8 are dependent from one of independent claims 1 and 7. Accordingly, it is also respectfully submitted that dependent claims 2 and 8 are distinguishable from Steiner as applied by the Examiner for at least the reasons previously described. Accordingly, it is also respectfully requested that the above 102 rejection of claims 2 and 8 be withdrawn.

New independent claims 12-17 are presented herein.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been overcome, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional

Application No.: 10/695,465

Docket No.: SONYJP 3.0-1044

objections which the Examiner might have. If there are any charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: August 2, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Dennis M. Smid

Registration No.: 34,930

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant

676391_1.DOC